

Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. Claims 15 and 16 have been added by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-4 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fujimoto; Claims 5-8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fujimoto; and Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Watanabe et al in view of Fujimoto.

Claims 1-4 and 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Fujimoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is directed to a noncontact type signal transmission device including at least one light-emitting device, at least one light-receiving device, and at least one beam condensing device disposed between the light-emitting device and the light-receiving device. The beam condensing device condenses a light from the light-emitting device in a direction substantially perpendicular to an orbit of a second member.

In a non-limiting example, Figure 6 of the present specification shows the light-emitting device 1, the light-receiving device 5, and the beam condensing device 3. The direction substantially perpendicular to the orbit is indicated in Figure 6 by Z' while the direction of the orbit is indicated by Y', which is perpendicular on Z'.

Fujimoto discloses in Figures 2, 5, and 6 a light condensing device 3 that condenses the light coming from the light-emitting device 1 in a direction substantially parallel to the orbit or in a direction perpendicular to the rotation axis. For example, in Figure 2 in Fujimoto an arrow shows the direction of the orbit, which corresponds to Y' in the present invention. In addition, as shown in Figures 5 and 6 the light condensing device 3 is not disposed between the light-emitting device 1 and a light-receiving device 5 but on a side of the light-emitting device 1 and the light-receiving device 5.

Therefore, Fujimoto does not teach or suggest a light condensing device that condenses the light from the light emitting device in a direction substantially perpendicular to the orbit and the light condensing device disposed between the light-emitting device and the light-receiving device, as required by Claim 1.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 1 and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Claims 5-8 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Fujimoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 5-8 and 12 depend directly on independent Claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons noted above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 5-8 and 12 are also allowable.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Watanabe et al in view of Fujimoto. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Watanabe et al disclose an X-ray computed tomography apparatus including various elements. As recognized by the outstanding Office Action at page 5, item 5, Watanabe et al do not disclose the use of a light condensing device, and therefore, Fujimoto is asserted for its teaching of a light condensing device. As discussed above, however, Fujimoto does not teach or suggest a light condensing device that condenses light from a light-emitting device in a direction substantially perpendicular to an orbit and the light-condensing device disposed between a light-emitting device and a light-receiving device. Therefore, Fujimoto cannot overcome the deficiencies of Watanabe et al.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 14 is also allowable.

In addition, new Claims 15-16 are added by the present response to set forth the invention in a various scope, and Applicants submit the new claims are supported by the

originally filed specification so that no new matter has been added. New Claims 15 and 16 include the features of Claim 1 discussed above, and therefore it is respectfully submitted new Claims 15 and 16 are allowable for similar reasons as discussed above regarding independent Claim 1.

In addition, both Claims 15 and 16 recite the feature of condensing the light from the light-emitting device to a position that is farther/closer to the light condensing device than to the light-receiving device. This feature advantageously radiates the light from the light-emitting device through the light condensing device onto the light-receiving device in a wider width (see as a non-limiting example Figure 6 in the present specification) than the effective width of the light-receiving device. Accordingly, attachment errors of the light-receiving device are permitted in the width direction.

On the contrary, the light condensing device of Fujimoto, as shown in Figures 5, 6, 12, and 14, is located at a position to condense the light from the light-emitting device 1 on the light-receiving device PD3. Therefore, the position of the light condensing devices recited in new Claims 15 and 16 further patentably distinguish over the light condensing device of Fujimoto.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present response, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599
Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423
Attorneys of Record



22850

(703) 413-3000
Fax #: (703)413-2220
GJM:SS/RFF/smi

I:\atty\Rff\0039\00397694\00397694-am.wpd

Marked-Up Copy
Serial No:
<u>09/559 071</u>
Amendment Filed on:
<u>7-18-02</u>

IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 15-16 (New).